

REMARKS

Presently, claims 3, 4, 6, 9, 13-17, 19, 20, and 31-36 are pending in the application. Claims 11, 12, 18, 21 and 24-27 have been canceled. Claims 3, 4, 9, 14, 15, 17, 19, and 20 have been amended to more clearly recite and to particularly point out the present invention. Additionally, new claims 31-36 have been added to alternatively recite the present invention. Support for the features of both the amended and the new claims may be found, for example, in the original claims (e.g., former claims 3 and 12) and in the specification, *inter alia*, at page 4, lines 14-15; page 7, lines 13-14; page 7, lines 27-28; and page 8, lines 28-29. Accordingly, no new matter has been added by the foregoing amendments.

CLAIM REJECTION – § 103(a)

In the Office Action of June 30, 2005, (hereinafter “Action”) the Examiner has rejected claims 3, 4, 6, 9, 11-21, and 24-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,933,811 to Angles et al. (“Angles”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,740,252 to Minor et al. (“Minor”).

In the Action, the Examiner admitted, “Angles does not explicitly teach a centralized demographic server that stores demographic information on a plurality of registered users, the demographic information being self-represented, wherein the retrieved demographic information is provided to said content server.” Action, at 3. The Examiner contended, however, that “Minor teaches a system that stores demographic information of multiple users and multiple sites, the demographic information being self-represented, and further comprising providing the demographic information pertaining to the particular registered user from the demographics sever to a content server (Minor, col. 2, lines 1-20 and 54-67).” *Id.* The Examiner also asserted that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to combine the teachings of Angles and Minor. *Id.* In view of the foregoing amendment, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, as discussed more fully below.

Angles teaches a network-implemented method and system for delivering customized electronic advertisements that are selected based upon user profiles and then integrated into web offerings maintained by other content providers. Angles' system is, therefore, a directed-marketing network that uses profiles to target specific consumer audiences. In particular, the matching of consumer profiles with advertising profiles occurs on advertisement provider computer 18. *See, e.g.*, Angles, col. 15, lines 20-30.

Minor teaches a method for passing encrypted demographic information between computers and includes the step of associating a computer operator with a set of demographic data. Encryption is performed such as to form an encoded demographic signal using a remote site encryption key. The encoded demographic signal is then combined with the remote site destination address to form an encoded demographic hyperlink transfer request that is used to access a remote computer and can be used by the remote computer to create customized replies.

Amended independent claim 3 recites:

A system for delivering customized web pages to users, said system comprising:

at least one content server that stores web page content for a plurality of web pages;

a centralized demographic server that retrieves demographic information via direct input from a user, the demographic information preserving the anonymity of the user; and

a computer associated with the user that stores the demographic information input by the user,

wherein said content server directs the user to said demographic sever for input of the demographic information, and

wherein said content server utilizes the stored demographic information from the computer to customize at least one web page request by the user.

Angles does not teach “a centralized demographic server that retrieves demographic information via direct input from a user,” as recited in independent claim 3. Initially, Applicant respectfully submits that Angles does not teach or suggest the use of a centralized demographic server, a fact which the Examiner admits at page 3 of the Action. Rather, Angles includes only a consumer computer, a content provider computer, and an advertisement provider computer. *See, e.g.*, Angles, col. 7, line 45 – col. 8, line 33; and Fig. 1. None of these are a centralized demographic server. Moreover, even if Angles could be construed to teach a centralized demographic server, Angles is silent as to where the demographic information is obtained from. Angeles teaches only that demographic data is stored in registration database 68. *See, e.g.*, Angles, col. 8, lines 12-14. Thus, the demographic information in Angles that is utilized by the advertisement provider computer to customize web pages is not retrieved “via direct input from a user.” Angeles does not teach or suggest the user inputting any demographic information to any component of the system.

Similarly, Angles does not teach or suggest the use of “demographic information preserving the anonymity of the user,” as recited in claim 3. The Examiner appears to rely on col. 13, line 55 – col. 14, line 58 of Angles for the proposition that Angles teaches the use of demographic information that does not particularly identify the user (see pg. 6 of the Action). However, the cited portion of Angles merely teaches the use of a customer member number. The use of a customer member number does not mean that the demographic data collected will preserve the user’s anonymity. Additional steps must be taken to protect the user’s privacy. Angles does not teach or suggest such steps, and is otherwise silent with respect to preserving a user’s anonymity. On the contrary, in Angels, it is likely that all data corresponding to a particular customer member is designated as being associated with the person to whom that number is assigned. Such a system does not therefore preserve the anonymity of the user, as recited in independent claim 3.

Angles also does not teach “stor[ing] the demographic information on the user’s computer” as recited in claim 3. In Angles, the demographic information is stored on the

advertisement provider computer. Angles therefore does not teach or suggest all of the elements of independent claim 3.

Likewise, Minor does also not teach or suggest “a centralized demographic server that retrieves demographic information via direct input from a user.” Minor teaches that “an operator of end-user computer 20 *registers* demographic information at a website demographic database 24A.” Minor, col. 2, lines 3-4 (emphasis added). The term “registers” as used in Minor implies only “associating a computer user with a set of demographic data.” Minor, col. 5, lines 48-53. Such a teaching, however, does not mean that demographic information is input directly from a user, but rather only that an association is made between data and a user.

Additionally, Minor does not teach that the demographic information itself preserves the anonymity of the user. Instead, Minor teaches the safeguarding of the user’s privacy by encrypting the demographic information for hyperlink transmission over a network. These two methods for safeguarding the privacy of the user are neither the same nor equivalent to one another. In Applicant’s invention, the content of the demographic information is such that the user’s anonymity is preserved, whether the demographic information is encrypted or not. However, Minor does not teach anything about the demographic data itself, other than that it is encrypted. In fact, Minor teaches away from the present invention. If encryption is the primary safeguard for the user’s privacy, as it is in Minor, then there is no need for the content of the demographic information (i.e., the demographic information itself) to preserve a user’s anonymity. Encryption tends, if anything, to increase the likelihood that sensitive demographic information will be gathered and stored without regard to protections for user anonymity in the data itself. Encryption generally enables the collection and storage of more information, not less. As such, Minor does not teach or suggest using demographic information that itself preserves the anonymity of the user.

Minor also does not teach or suggest “storing the demographic information on the user’s computer,” as recited in claim 3. Encrypted transmission by its very nature removes the need to appoint a fixed location for storing the sensitive information. By

teaching a method to transmit encrypted demographic information over a network, Minor therefore teaches away from designating a single place for storing the demographic information. Consequently, Minor does not teach or suggest all the elements of independent claim 3.

Not only do Angles and Minor not individually teach or suggest Applicant's invention, but the combination of Angles and Minor neither teaches nor suggests all elements of independent claim 3. That is, even when combined, the references do not teach or suggest direct user input of demographic data that preserves user anonymity or the storage of such information on the user's computer.

Applicant further respectfully reiterates the argument previously submitted at page 9 of the Amendment dated April 10, 2005, in response to the previous Office Action, that it would not have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to have combined Minor's teachings with those of Angles. The focus of Minor is the encrypted transmission of demographics data over a computer network. Angles, on the other hand, processes all demographic data in one place, namely, the advertisement provider computer 18. One of ordinary skill in the art, therefore, would not look to a system improving upon encrypted-transmission of data (*i.e.*, Minor) to improve upon a system that permits the sensitive data to remain in one location (*i.e.*, Angles). Knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art would not provide a reason to look to encrypted-transmission technology, generally, or Minor, in particular, to modify the teachings of Angels to result in Applicant's claimed invention. Moreover, there are no explicit references in Angles that would lead one of ordinary skill in the art to seek out encryption technology as a possible avenue for improving Angles. Accordingly, independent claim 3 is believed to be allowable over the combination of Angels and Minor

Independent claim 15 recites "retriev[ing] demographic information pertaining to a registered user by direct user input, wherein the demographic data preserves the anonymity of the user;" and "storing the demographic information on a computer associated with the registered user." Similarly, new independent claim 31 recites

retrieving demographic information that was “previously directly input by the requestor to a demographic server, wherein the demographic information is stored on the requestor’s computer, and wherein the demographic information does not reveal the requestor’s identity.” For the same reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 3, independent claims 15 and 31 are believed to be allowable over Angels and Minor, taken either individually or in combination.

Dependent claims 4, 6, 9, 13-14, 16-17, 19, 20, and 32-36 are allowable at least by their dependency on independent claims 3, 15 and 31, respectively. Claims 11, 12, 18, 21 and 24-27 have been canceled. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner’s obviousness rejection of claims 3, 4, 6, 9, 11-21, and 24-27 are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner’s rejection has been overcome, and that the application, including claims 3, 4, 6, 9, 13-17, 19, 20, and 31-36, is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner’s rejection and an early Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 10/27/05 By: Andrew W. Spicer
Andrew W. Spicer
Registration No. 57,420
Technology, Patents, & Licensing, Inc.
6206 Kellers Church Road
Pipersville, PA 18947
Telephone: 215-766-2100
Facsimile: 215-766-2920